






P Parking Tariffs Apply

Tariffs		How to Pay	
Mon 8am - Sat 8am Ticket expires on Sat at 8am Up to 1 hour £2.50 Up to 2 hours £4.50 Up to 4 hours £6.00 Up to 6 hours £8.00 Up to 9 hours £10.50 Up to 24 hours £16.00	Sat 8am - Mon 8am Ticket expires on Mon at 8am Up to 24 hours £5.00 Up to 48 hours £10.00 Contract parking available please call: 0161 228 2288 - Ext 830	 Download the app or visit paybyphone.co.uk Text 65565 to your registered 0330 400 7275 Location: 8599	 At the payment machine at any time before exiting the car park – your full, correct vehicle registration will be required Parking tariffs apply 24 hours a day, 7 days a week

 Blue Badge holders - tariffs and all terms & conditions apply
  Park within marked bays
  No parking on yellow lines/hatched areas


Failure to comply with the terms & conditions will result in a Parking Charge of: £100

ParkingEye Ltd is authorised by the landowner to operate this private car park for and on its behalf. Certain parking terms and conditions apply, which are set out within this notice (the "Parking Contract"). By parking, waiting or otherwise remaining within this car park, you agree to comply with the Parking Contract, including making payment as required and entering your vehicle registration details via the payment and/or terminals. If you fail to comply with the Parking Contract, you will become liable to pay the sum specified on this notice (the "Parking Charge"). If a Parking Charge becomes due, a reduced payment option will be available for a specified period confirmed in writing by ParkingEye Ltd. Please note that ParkingEye Ltd is not responsible for the car park surface, damage or loss to or from motor vehicles, or general site safety. In addition to the Parking Contract please see privacy information below.

Privacy Information - when you use this car park, ParkingEye Ltd collects and processes certain data in order to ensure that you are complying with our terms and conditions and to enforce these where necessary. We also use the data for car park management. This will include, for example, reporting on vehicle turnover and repeat visits in order to improve the customer experience. The data we collect comprises images of vehicles using the car park and/or the vehicle registration mark. This is collected via Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras and/or attendants on-site, as well as via payment machines or terminals. We may share data from time to time with third parties for the purposes stated above. When collecting the data specified above, ParkingEye Ltd is the Data Controller. For more information, including details about your rights as a data subject, please visit our website at www.parkingeye.co.uk/privacy-policy. Alternatively, you can email us at privacy@parkingeye.co.uk or contact us by telephone at 0333 1235 884.

ParkingEye Ltd
 Telephone 0330 555 4444
 PO BOX 565, Chorley, PR6 6HT

This car park is private property

 Car park monitored by ANPR systems

TOPIC GUIDE

FUNDING AND FINANCING OF SUSTAINABLE URBAN MOBILITY MEASURES

Imprint

About:

This Topic Guide has been developed within the framework of the SUITS and SUMPs-Up projects, funded under the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreements no. 690650 and 690669.

Title:

Funding and financing of Sustainable Urban Mobility Measures

Authors:

Stefan Werland (Wuppertal Institute)
Frederic Rudolph (Wuppertal Institute)

Reviewers:

Vincent Leiner (EC)
Axel Volkery (EC)
Ana Dragutescu (ICLEI)

Acknowledgement:

This publication is made possible thanks to the contributions made by organisations involved in the SUITS and SUMPs-Up projects, all of whom are credited for their respective contributions.

Disclaimer:

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors named and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

Copyright:

All images in this publication are the property of the organisations or individuals credited. Use of this document is governed by a Creative Commons License CC BY-NC-ND 4.0.

Cover picture:

© Frederic Rudolph (Manchester)

Contacts:

Stefan Werland, Wuppertal Institute, Neue Promenade 6, DE-10178 Berlin,
Tel.: +49 30-2887458-28, E-Mail: stefan.werland@wupperinst.org

Dr Frederic Rudolph, Wuppertal Institute, Döppersberg 19, DE-42103 Wuppertal,
Tel.: +49-202-2492-230, E-Mail: frederic.rudolph@wupperinst.org, Twitter: @fre_rud

September 2019

Contents

1	Executive summary	5
2	Introduction	6
3	The 8 SUMP principle in the context of funding and financing	8
4	Sustainable urban mobility planning steps for SUMP funding and financing	10
5	Funding and Financing Options for Sustainable Urban Mobility	12
5.1	Local revenue streams	14
5.1.1	Project related income	14
5.1.2	Pricing measures for individual car use	14
5.2	Employers contributions	18
5.3	Value capture instruments	19
5.4	Local Option Sales Taxes	22
6	National level funding	23
7	European Funding and Financing Sources	24
7.1	Support instruments for the application process	25
8	Debt mechanisms and external financing	26
8.1	Loans	26
8.2	City Bonds	27
8.3	Green City Bonds	28
9	Facilitating the Involvement of the Private Sector	29
9.1	Engaging private companies as service providers	30
9.2	Public private partnerships in infrastructure development	31
10	Overview of funding and financing instruments	32
11	List of references	33

Guide to the reader

This document provides guidance on a specific topic related to *Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning (SUMP)*. It is based on the concept of SUMP, as outlined by the European Commission's Urban Mobility Package¹ and described in detail in the European SUMP Guidelines (second edition)².

Sustainable Urban Mobility Planning is a strategic and integrated approach for dealing with the complexity of urban transport. Its core goal is to improve accessibility and quality of life by achieving a shift towards sustainable mobility. SUMP advocates for fact-based decision making guided by a long-term vision for sustainable mobility. As key components, this requires a thorough assessment of the current situation and future trends, a widely supported common vision with strategic objectives, and an integrated set of regulatory, promotional, financial, technical and infrastructure measures to deliver the objectives – whose implementation should be accompanied by reliable monitoring and evaluation.

In contrast to traditional planning approaches, SUMP places particular emphasis on the involvement of citizens and stakeholders, the coordination of policies between sectors (transport, land use, environment, economic development, social policy, health, safety, energy, etc.), and a broad cooperation across different layers of government and with private actors.

This document is part of a *compendium of guides and briefings* that complement the newly updated second

edition of the SUMP Guidelines. They elaborate difficult planning aspects in more detail, provide guidance for specific contexts, or focus on important policy fields. Two types of documents exist: While 'Topic Guides' provide comprehensive planning recommendations on established topics, 'Practitioner Briefings' are less elaborate documents addressing emerging topics with a higher level of uncertainty.

Guides and briefings on how to address the following topics in a SUMP process are published together with the second edition of the SUMP Guidelines in 2019:

- **Planning process:** Participation; Monitoring and evaluation; Institutional cooperation; Measure selection; Action planning; Funding and financing; Procurement.
- **Contexts:** Metropolitan regions; Polycentric regions; Smaller cities; National support.
- **Policy fields:** Safety; Health; Energy (SECAPs); Logistics; Walking; Cycling; Parking; Shared mobility; Mobility as a Service; Intelligent Transport Systems; Electrification; Access regulation; Automation.

They are part of a growing knowledge base that will be regularly updated with new guidance. All the latest documents can always be found in the 'Mobility Plans' section of the European Commission's urban mobility portal Eltis (www.eltis.org).

¹ Annex 1 of COM(2013) 91

² Rupprecht Consult - Forschung & Beratung GmbH (editor), 2019
Guidelines for Developing and Implementing a Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan, Second Edition.



photo © Frederic Rudolph [Manchester]

1. Executive summary

This Topic Guide relates to Activity 8.2: Estimate costs and identify funding sources and Activity 9.2: Develop financial plans and agree cost sharing of the 3rd phase of the SUMP cycle. It supports urban transport practitioners and other stakeholders identifying funding and financing options for the development of SUMP, the implementation of measures, and the operation of transport services.

The transformation of urban mobility systems causes financial costs for the procurement and operation of innovative products and services and for the adaptation of existing infrastructure. While public budgets are limited, investments in infrastructure and transport services compete against other spending priorities, and private investors often are reluctant to invest into sustainable transport projects. Thus, cities need to seek additional funding and financing options and to develop business models to attract private sector investments in the development of the urban transport system. Moreover, financing schemes should cover the entire SUMP cycle, starting from planning, to project implementation and procurement up to the operation and maintenance of services and infrastructures.

This requires the blending of different revenue sources, including:

- project related revenue sources such as public transport fares and the lease of advertising space in buses;
- the extension of the local tax base, for example through the introduction of road user charges and parking fees or the use of value capture mechanisms;
- National, bilateral, and European grants;
- Debt financing through loans and other instruments such as issuing green bonds.

Finally, a prudential engagement of the private sector in infrastructure development and service provision can reduce the direct burden on public budgets while enhancing service quality (cf. Figure 1: Overview of funding and financing instruments).

The applicability of specific financing options critically depends on the national legislative environment. Many of the instruments and case examples presented here may not be transferred to other Member States due to the different distribution of responsibilities and powers between the political levels in the Member States. This report, however, can inspire the search for potential funding and financing sources and is therefore aimed not only at local and regional authorities but also at decision-makers at the national level. Still, whether a specific instrument can be used in a Member State needs to be assessed on a case-by-case base.



© Stefan Werland, Berlin

2. Introduction

Although many sustainability solutions have positive effects on public budgets in the mid- to long-run, the transformation of mobility systems requires capital investments that often exceed the direct costs of conventional solutions. The transition towards sustainable urban mobility systems requires both upfront financing and long-term funding for re-paying the initial expenses.

Most added values that sustainable mobility options provide – such as increased liveability of cities, positive health impacts, increased accessibility – are not considered in cost-benefit estimates since they are diffuse and often hard to monetise, they reduce the

burden on other departments' budgets or other tiers of government (e.g. the national level) profit.

While the public sector often has a limited capacity of financing, private investors often are reluctant to invest in sustainable transport and mobility projects, as they consider the provision of urban mobility a public service and thus do not expect high financial returns (European Commission, 2014; Shergold & Parkhurst, 2016).

An analysis carried out in the SUMP's Up project indicates that financing sump development and measure implementation is a mayor barrier for the uptake of the SUMP concept across the EU (Chinellato et al., 2017).

	France (N=32)	Germany (N=16)	Italy (N=17)	Poland (N=17)	Romania (N=31)	Spain (N=61)	Greece (N=35)	All countries (N=328)
None	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	2%
Institutional framework (responsibilities and requirements for cooperation)	28%	56%	65%	29%	42%	41%	74%	47%
Legal framework for mobility planning	22%	50%	47%	53%	45%	51%	66%	49%
Legal framework for the integration of mobility and land use planning	38%	69%	71%	59%	39%	52%	69%	52%
Networking and monitoring	38%	25%	29%	24%	32%	41%	49%	38%
Guidance, expertise and training	47%	31%	47%	71%	42%	56%	83%	54%
Financing SUMP development	44%	63%	71%	59%	32%	64%	69%	59%
Financing SUMP measures	78%	69%	88%	76%	65%	82%	94%	78%
Other	3%	13%	0%	0%	3%	3%	0%	3%

Table 1: Additional support needed from national government for SUMP development for countries with at least 15 participating cities (multiple answers possible; results are not weighted by country population). Source: (Chinellato et al., 2017, p. 30)

To overcome this financial gap, municipalities and regions need to seek smart funding and financing options beyond the use of public budget and 'classic' debt financing. They need to develop financing models and to ensure reliable funding streams to attract private sector investments. Covering the long-term funding needs of a sustainable urban transport system comprises a well-balanced combination of user charges, local taxes, transfer payments and subsidies.

Still, the transition towards a sustainable urban mobility system that is universally accessible and meets the basic mobility needs of all users requires a readjustment of the financial environment: The greatest share of funding, financing, and implicit subsidies still go into motorised individual transport. One main reason for the slow uptake of sustainable transport options is that the true costs of individual car trips are not reflected in prices and, on the individual level, the use of a car is not related to out-of-pocket costs – unlike the purchase of public transport

tickets. The introduction of push & pull approaches, that aim at pricing private car use while re-investing revenues into more sustainable alternatives is one puzzle piece of a more sustainable urban mobility system.

This Topic Guide structures the different funding and finance options for sustainable urban mobility actions. It informs public authorities, urban mobility practitioners, and policymakers about funding and financing options that facilitate the transformation of urban mobility systems towards sustainability. It aims at compiling publicly accessible – though dispersed – knowledge better accessible, including cities' experiences, outcomes of research projects and information provided by key stakeholders such as the European Investment Bank. While this guidance cannot explore all options in detail, it may serve as a source of inspiration for sustainable financing actions and the identification of funding sources.

Parts of this Topic Guide are based on the CIVITAS SUITS project's Guidelines to Innovative Financing, edited by Aleksei Lugovoi and Alice Parker (Arcadis).

Moreover, the following persons provided valuable contributions:

- Agenzia Mobilità Ambiente e Territorio, Milano: Valentino Sevino
- Área Metropolitana do Porto: Carla Oliveira
- Birmingham City Council: Helen Jenkins
- City of Cluj Napoca: Ghiurco Razvan Ionut
- City of Donostia-San Sebastián: Iñaki Baro
- City of Edinburgh: Steven Murrell, George Lowder, Katherine Soane, Charles Graham, Gavin Graham, Mollie Kerr, Kyle Drummond.
- City of Maia: Marta Susana Moreira
- Ile de France Mobilités: Laurence Debrincat
- Sofia Urban Mobility Centre: Desislava Hristova
- Torino Wireless: Chiara L. G. Ferroni
- Wuppertal Institute: Thorsten Koska, Kain Glensor

It also considers the outcomes of session C3 of the 2019 SUMP conference in Groningen and the contributions of:

- Vincent Leiner (DG Regio)
- Ivo Cré (Polis)
- Ozhan Yilmaz (EIB)
- Samuel Alexios Salem (Transport Authority of Thessaloniki)

3. The 8 SUMP principles in the context of funding and financing

1. Plan for sustainable mobility in the 'functional city'

Planning for the functional area requires costs sharing and compensation mechanisms between the individual municipalities in the region.

Since local public transport services usually do not operate cost-effectively and are financed through a combination of user fees, public subsidies, and other sources, the provision of an integrated, coherent tariff policy and seamless transport services requires cost-sharing and compensation agreements. Integration might be facilitated through the existence or creation of a regional or metropolitan public transport authority.

Inner cities profit from investments into region-wide public transport and bike corridors due to reduced private car commuting, congestion and parking pressure. Hence, central municipalities should financially contribute to the provision of bike infrastructure and park and ride facilities at stations in the functional area. On the other hand, municipalities in the hinterland benefit from increasing land and property values when connected to public transport infrastructures – specifically under transit oriented development schemes. A fair allocation of financial contributions among municipalities to the mobility system is key for a sustainable mobility in the functional area.

Finally, demand management instruments are powerful measures that combine disincentives for the use of private cars and produce revenues that can be re-invested into high-quality mobility alternatives. However, the introduction of parking management in one municipality or district may increase parking pressure in neighbouring areas; or inter-municipal competition to attract customers may lead to a 'race to the bottom' on parking fees. To avoid problem shifting, pricing measures need to be coordinated among the municipalities within the functional area.

2. Cooperate across institutional boundaries

Financing schemes for sustainable urban mobility solutions will blend different sources of investment capital, ranging from local level revenues to regional and national programmes, bi-lateral initiatives, up to European instruments.

While pricing measures generate income for public budgets and thus affect the financial administration, available support programmes and instruments are rooted in a broad range of policy areas – including environmental, climate, economic, industry, research, or regional development – and involve authorities from policy areas beyond transport.

Integration of environmental policy, transport planning and fiscal policy: concerns about GHG emissions and air pollution, or adaptation to climate change can provide legal justifications for pricing private car use. Beyond push and pull approaches that not only generate environmental benefits but also provide financial revenues for implementing sustainable mobility measures (see Chapter 5.1.2 on pricing measures), actors such as environmental ministries or climate funds can provide financial support for low carbon urban mobility measures.

Integration of spatial and transport planning: Public investments in public transportation services and infrastructure can increase adjacent land values, thus generating a profit for private landowners. The resultant increases in land value (which otherwise benefit private landowners cost-free) may be 'captured' by converting them into public revenue through various mechanisms. Vice versa, new residential development could place extra burdens on the existing infrastructure and resources in the local area, such as an increased volume of traffic and congestion. Capturing added value from public investments requires cooperation among mobility and land use planning as well as taxation authorities (see Chapter 5.3 on value capture instruments).

3. Involve citizens and relevant stakeholders

A Sustainable Urban Mobility Plan focuses on meeting the mobility needs of the people. Many pricing measures such as the introduction of parking fees or road charging, however, commonly are perceived as another burden placed on commuters and urban dwellers. Thus, it is important to increase acceptance of these measures, inter alia by lining out how these measures contribute to the provision of high-quality travel alternatives and to the agreed vision on future urban mobility.

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are forms of cooperation between public authorities and businesses to deliver a public infrastructure project and service under a long-term contract. PPP arrangements are mechanisms for cost- and risk sharing among those partners. Properly prepared and managed PPP projects can significantly reduce immediate costs for the public sector.

4. Assess current and future performance

Taxes, fees and charges should be arranged in a way they steer demand for transport and mobility. Financial mechanisms such as congestion charges, parking policies and toll roads are financial instruments that aim at discouraging private car use. If these mechanisms successfully discourage the use of cars, city revenues may decrease over time. At the same time, costs and proceeds for other modes such as collective transport and shared mobility may vary due to increasing demand. When applying demand management measures, cities should anticipate these impacts, prepare for turnover variation of involved institutions and apply institutional governance.

5. Define a long-term vision and a clear implementation plan

Financing relates to ensuring that the financial resources or mechanisms are in place to cover the project costs as they occur. Infrastructure may incur heavy upfront investments, while the provision of services requires long-term financing for personnel costs, energy use or

the replacement and maintenance of vehicles. Therefore, implementation plans will have to rely on different financial sources that cover both non-recurring upfront costs and recurring cost.

6. Develop all transport modes in an integrated manner

While a significant share of public spending currently goes to individual private car use, sustainable urban mobility financing aims at making alternatives more viable and attractive. The urban mobility transition requires a shift of focus from individual motorised transport to public transport and active modes. The aim is to optimise the integration of mobility options rather than favouring a specific solution.

7. Arrange for monitoring and evaluation

Ensuring that scarce public resources are invested is in line with the municipalities or the region's visions on sustainable mobility is one key precondition for the urban mobility transition. Sound monitoring and evaluation requires the provision of data from all stakeholders involved, including private sector partners. Adequate specifications need to be made in tendering documents.

8. Assure quality

High quality of services will attract commuters to public transport and sharing systems. Continuous monitoring of service levels and the perceived quality of public transport services, in combination with contracts that comprise incentives for over-compliance and deductions for underperformance can enhance quality of transport services.

4. Sustainable urban mobility planning steps for SUMP funding and financing

This Topic Guide relates to the 3rd phase of the SUMP cycle (Activity 8.2: Estimate costs and identify funding sources and Activity 9.2: Develop financial plans and agree cost sharing). The comparison of costs and benefits in step 7 of the SUMP cycle has informed the selection of measures and measure packages, taking into account their likely overall economic performance including wider social, health and environmental impacts (see box on project appraisal and cost-benefit analysis below). Preparing the implementation of selected measures (step 10) requires assessing investment needs and potential project revenues, identifying funding sources and financing options (Activity 8.2), and the formulation of detailed financing plans (Activity 9.2).¹

Project appraisal and Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA)

Project appraisal is usually supported by decision support tools such as cost-benefit analysis (CBA) or multi-criteria analysis (MCA). These can be used to assess (ex-ante and/or ex-post) the potential or observed value added of different policy options and to assist decision-makers in selecting appropriate policies. CBA is a tool to improve project design, including options analysis, and in this respect its use upstream during the project cycle is recommended.

Typically, CBAs only assess project related direct costs and revenues, but they can be expanded to also cover indirect costs and benefits, given these can be expressed in monetary terms. CBAs are sometimes complemented with a multi-criteria analysis (MCA) to allow appraisal of criteria that are not monetised.

While one of the main advantages of CBAs is transparency and the ease in communicating the results, care must be taken selecting the assessment criteria and parameters. Since conducting a CBA can be a time-, resource- and data-intensive task, wider social, environmental and economic impacts, along with less tangible effects such as comfort, quality of life or aesthetics, are frequently excluded from the assessment – even though they might form central pillars of a SUMP. Moreover, the monetisation of non-monetary effects is difficult and can be controversial.

The following steps need to be considered when carrying out a project appraisal:

- Identify the objectives of the project and the criteria against which it will be assessed. Clearly define the boundary of the analysis, and its perspective (e.g. the functional area) and the period over which costs and benefits are analysed
- Identify alternatives and/or business as usual or do nothing/minimum scenarios.
- Identify and quantify the effect of each scenario/project on the criteria. Some impacts might have been identified that are not quantifiable and/or difficult to measure. In a conventional CBA, these impacts are often excluded.
- Apply monetisation factors: The monetisation of non-monetary effects is difficult and current approaches – such as monetisation of costs of fatal accidents – are controversial. As this is an elaborate process, often guideline values are used (e.g. a standard value for the costs of one tonne of local particulate matter emitted).
- Apply local discounting rates. Future costs and benefits are discounted to their present value, allowing comparison of costs or benefits that occur at different times.
- Calculate the various output values, such as Net Present Value (NPV), Benefit to Cost Ratio (BCR) and Internal Rate of Return (IRR).
- Perform a sensitivity analysis on those variables deemed to be uncertain (e.g. discount rate, project lifetime, contentious monetisation factors).

The CIVITAS Urban Mobility Tool Inventory provides tools that support project appraisal, including the conversion of relevant effects into monetary units. For example, the uemi/solutions Impact assessment methodology for urban transport innovations is an easy to apply tool for small scale measures, which includes CBA elements.

¹All tools can be accessed at the CIVITAS Urban Mobility Tool Inventory Website: <https://civitas.eu/tool-inventory>

The purpose of Activity 8.2 is to determine and to compare the performance of different measures and investment options and to rule out those measures that are not financially viable. It will also assess project-related revenues and their financial contribution to the transition of the urban mobility system. Activity 9.2 comprises a more detailed assessment of investment needs, revenues, financing and funding sources for selected measures and measure packages. Municipalities should determine investment and maintenance costs, potential changes in revenue streams, identify financial contributors, and develop a funding and financing scheme for all measures/actions. Based on your organisation's conventions, a detailed financial scheme will be developed as part of the SUMP or within a separate process.



5. Funding and Financing Options for Sustainable Urban Mobility

The development and implementation of innovative projects and high quality services may entail extra upfront costs, for example for the adaptation of infrastructure assets or the procurement of new technologies that have not yet reached cost parity with conventional solutions. Regarding tight public budgets, cities may employ innovative funding and financing options and seek private sector engagement to reduce direct costs and risks. Identifying revenue sources, which can be used to fund sustainable transport measures, forms an important component of a SUMP.

Common challenges related to financing sustainable mobility measures

Sustainable funding and financing refers to mechanisms to mobilise, govern or distribute financial resources for public transport and non-motorised modes and to steer demand for transport (also known as mobility management). They build on the principles of environmental and financial sustainability, that means they should also provide value for taxpayers' money and have the ability to bridge funding shortfalls and/or to create new funding streams.

That said, local authorities may face a number of challenges when considering the implementation of sustainable urban transport and mobility projects (JRC 2018):

(1) Lack of capacities

- Lack of awareness of alternative finance options: Local authorities usually rely on public funds and are unaware of financing tools such as municipal and green bonds (see Chapter 8)
- Multitude of public funds from different European sources: There is a range of public funding mechanisms on the EU level, as outlined in chapter 7. Lack of legal and technical expertise and capacities for the preparation of applications and securing financing can be challenging.

(2) Political and institutional barriers

- Political resistance against local revenue sources such as parking management or road fees, which make use of private cars less attractive (see Chapter 5.1.2).
- Lack of legal entitlement to raise mobility related charges and taxes.

(3) Lack of financial resources and bankable projects

- Own contributions: Most public funding schemes prescribe that recipients contribute a share of the budget on their own. Tight municipal budgets often limit cities' ability to apply for funding. Thus, setting up a project might require a mix of funding and financing mechanisms (Chapter 7 and 8).
- Ensuring the bankability of projects to ensure the willingness of private investors to finance a project. other tiers of government (e.g. the regional, national, or the European level).

Funding and financing

Financing means to mobilise financial resources to cover upfront investments for the construction of infrastructure, the procurement of vehicles and works, or the provision of services. Sources of financing are public budgets or forms of debt financing from private banks, and investors, including private equity firms and institutional investors such as pension funds or insurers. Debt financing is tied to repayment obligations.

Funding relates to sourcing financial resources to (re-)pay the upfront and on-going expenditures over the lifecycle. A long-term funding model, i.e. a plan how to refinance initial expenses, often is a precondition for assessing private finance. Cash flows can be extracted directly from users of a service or an infrastructure asset in forms of fees and charges, or from groups that otherwise profit from public investments, for example property owners in the vicinity of public transport stations (local taxes). Other sources of funding are financial transfers from the general budget or other tiers of government (e.g. the regional, national, or the European level).

Funding sources for urban mobility comprise project-generated revenues, local taxation and transfer payments from other tiers of government or the EU. The combination funding and financing sources will vary widely from city to city and from project to project. While financial allocations from the municipal budget are the most important source of income, many cities introduced transport-related fees and charges to increase their tax base (see Chapter 5). Most cities receive transfer payments for the provision of public transport services from the national or regional level. National and EU level funding (see Chapter 7) and lending instruments (see Chapter 8) are common for the realisation of larger scale projects, along with Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs, see Chapter 9).

Which funding options can be used critically depends on the national legislative environment and the legal power of municipalities to raise charges and taxes. This report can inspire the search for potential funding and financing sources. Still, whether a specific instrument can be used in a Member State needs to be assessed on a case-by-case base.

The following sections provide an overview of funding and financing options for sustainable urban transport measures.




Figure 1: Overview of funding and financing instruments



© Stefan Werland, Berlin

5.1. Local revenue streams

General city budgets and transfer payments from the national level usually are the main financing sources for urban mobility systems. Still, depending on the respective Member State's legal system and the constitutional competencies of local administrations, municipalities may exploit additional sources for financing the urban mobility system. This section outlines local revenue streams that are (or: can be) linked to sustainable urban mobility.

5.1.1. Project related income

Project generated income are public transport user fares or other revenue sources such as the lease of advertising space in vehicles or at bus stops. They cover a share of the operating costs of a transport solution, for example a tramway or a BRT route. Project generated income will only be available after the start of the service, during the operation stage. Hence, using expected future revenues for upfront construction costs requires additional financing arrangements or private sector involvements (see Chapter 9) for leveraging investments. Anticipated incomes from the operation can be used for capital borrowing or as means to attract external investors via the emission of bonds (see Chapter 5.4) or serve as basis for value capture mechanisms (see Chapter 5.1.3)

There is a trade-off between cost coverage on the one hand and social concerns and attractiveness on the other hand: Since the provision of public transport is considered a general interest, fares will normally not cover all operation costs. Ticket prices need to respond to social concerns by keeping the general fare level low and by allowing reduced fares for low-income populations or pupils. To be effective, ticket prices should be lower than variable costs of private car use (besides fuel costs, these can be parking fees or road charges, see Chapter 5.1.2) to make public transport the more attractive alternative.

Public and private transport operators as service providers (see Chapter 9.1) will have to be compensated from the general public budget or from ring-fenced incomes from other sources such as parking management, road charges, and value-capture mechanisms as exemplified in the following.

5.1.2. Pricing measures for individual car use

Pricing measures are mechanisms that directly charge motorists for the use of an infrastructure asset such as a parking space or a road. Existing taxes and fees levied on private car use – such as fuel taxes, vehicle taxes or registration fees – neither reflect the social and environmental costs nor do they achieve a shift towards more sustainable mobility options. Moreover, these financial streams normally go into the national general budget and cities do not profit directly.

Adopting the user-pays or polluter-pays principle is a key component of a sustainable urban mobility system. The rationale behind pricing measures is to charge private car users for at least a substantial share of the external costs they generate. Local level pricing measures aim at changing travel habits, at managing transport demand. Price signals link car use to directly discernible out-of-pocket costs and thus may encourage the use of more sustainable transport options. They also generate revenues that might be ring-fenced for enhancing public transport and active modes in so-called push & pull approaches

The EU's position on external costs of road use

The EU encourages Member States "to use taxation and infrastructure charging in the most effective and fair manner in order to promote the 'user pays' and 'polluter pays' principles, as enshrined in the treaties.

This framework contributes to the internalisation of external costs related to road transport, such as those generated by the use of infrastructure or its environmental and social impacts. With the internalisation of costs, the EU also wants to encourage a more efficient use of transport infrastructures currently affected by congestion, thus reducing time wasted due to bottlenecks.

Road charging can also be a useful instrument to generate new sources of revenue to help develop Europe's vital infrastructure, as well as cleaner, more energy-efficient modes of transport."

https://ec.europa.eu/transport/modes/road/road_charging_en

Transport demand managing measures that aim at discouraging private car usage through pricing mechanisms usually meet political resistance. Public acceptance of pricing measures tends to be low, as they are often perceived to be socially unacceptable, to deter customers, and to add another burden on motorists who already pay a lot of taxes.

This implies that push measures should be presented in a way to minimise public opposition as to 'make the unpopular popular' (de Groot & Schuitema, 2012). It is important to allow sufficient time for users to adapt their behaviour, for example through trial periods with free public transport. Setting up a trial period may be a means to gain approval from the population (Gu et al. 2018). In many cases, acceptance tends to rise during the operation of a pricing scheme. For instance, despite an initial strong disapproval, the congestion charge in

Stockholm was supported by the majority of voters in a referendum, following a seven-month full-scale trial period. In Milano, the extension of the existing charging scheme was supported by 79% of the voters in 2012. Also, studies showed the importance of clearly stating that revenues will be re-invested into the mobility system, including high-quality public transport but also the maintenance of roads. The provision of viable public transport alternatives before the introduction of charging schemes, also during off-peak hours, is also commonly considered a success factor.

When estimating future revenues it is important to keep in mind that the primary objective of pricing measures is to reduce private car use. That means that, if successful, the measure will undermine its income-generating base in the mid-term.

Road pricing and congestion charges

Road pricing was introduced as a charge on the use of a specific infrastructure asset such as a motorway, a bridge or a tunnel, often in the framework of a concession agreement with a private operator (see the section on public private partnerships, Ch.9). More recently, road pricing was extended to city areas and road networks, and new schemes were introduced, including cordon and zone pricing, or distance and time based charging systems. Road pricing aims at reducing traffic loads and congestion and at making cities more liveable. Road pricing schemes can have a strong influence on reducing the volume of traffic and on encouraging people to switch to other modes of transport (e.g. Rye 2016; Sammer 2016). There are different ways to implement such systems:

- as toll roads, where a fee is paid for the right to use a specific asset such as a highway or a bridge;
- as zonal schemes where vehicles travelling inside a specific bounded area are charged; as cordon schemes, where vehicles must pay for entering the city centre; or
- as distance-based schemes, where car drivers pay per km travelled. Distance-based schemes

require the use of car positioning systems and thus are technically demanding and may interfere with personal data protection (Gu et al. 2018).


Dynamic road charges that are higher in during peak hours, or a linked to emission standards (or potentially to vehicle weight or size) may also affect mobility behaviour and the composition of the car fleet. The City of Milano, for example, exempts electric vehicles, hybrids, motorcycles and vehicles emitting less than 100g CO₂/km from fees to enter its Urban Road Toll and Low Emission Zone Area C.

Costs of implementing and operating a charging system vary according to technologies employed: fully automated systems with number plate recognition or GPS monitoring demand higher upfront investments than the regulation via the sale of licence stickers, while the latter require higher staff costs for sale, control and enforcement.

Still, due to the often lacking legal power of municipalities to introduce such charges, to political resistance, to high upfront investments and concerns about privacy (linked to automatic number plate recognition), only few cities in the EU have implemented road charging systems, including London, Durham, Stockholm, Gothenburg, Milano, or Valletta.

Increasing acceptance of pricing measures

- Inform the public well in advance about the objective of the charging system, its intended impacts, and how revenues will be used.
- Communicate the measure in a positive way: as a way to ease pressure on the city's mobility system and to make other mobility options more attractive.
- Stress the role of the charging system as component of an encompassing mobility strategy.
- Provide adequate mobility alternatives use before introducing charging schemes
- Conduct a trial period to allow road users to accustom to the new system, to test alternative travel options, and to experience potential benefits of the scheme.
- Consider concerns about equity and fairness, e.g. exemptions for vehicles used by people with reduced mobility



which was introduced in 2008 as an attempt to reduce exceeding PM10 levels. In March 2013, the Municipal Board has confirmed AREA C as a permanent and strategic measure.

The installation of Area C led to a reduction daily vehicles entrance from 132,000 entrances in 2012 to 82,000 in 2018 and traffic congestion was reduced by 37,7%. The speed of public transport was increased and the number of public transport users went up by 12% on surface and by 17% for underground public transport. Road accidents went down by 26% and air quality increased (total PM10 -18%; Exhaust PM10 -10%; Ammonia -42%; Nitrogen Oxides -18%; Carbon Dioxide -35%).

During the year 2018, Area C generated revenues of approx. €33 million, 65% of which have been reinvested for the strengthening of public transport, 22% for development of sustainable mobility projects and infrastructures, and 16% of the incomes have been used for the operating costs of the system.

City Example: Milan's Area C

The City of Milan introduced a congestion charge system "Area C" on January 16, 2012. The area subject to the congestion charge is called Cerchia dei Bastioni, a Limited Traffic Zone of 8.2 km², equivalent to 4.5% of the whole territory of the Municipality of Milan. The access is limited from Monday to Friday from 7.30 am to 7:30 pm. Cars entering Area C are detected by a system of 43 electronic gates (of which 7 are reserved for public transport vehicles), equipped with automatic number plate recognition technology.

The entrance ticket costs €5. Residents have 40 accesses per year free and pay €2 from 41st access onward. Electric vehicles, scooters and motorcycles, public transport vehicles, taxis, emergency vehicles, police, fire brigades, vehicles with disabled people on board are exempted from the fee. Vehicles with Euro 0 (petrol), Euro 1, 2, 3, 4 (diesel) and vehicles longer than 7 meters are not allowed to enter Area C. The entry of non-electric freight vehicles is not permitted from 8am to 10pm.

Area C was introduced following a public referendum in which a 79% of voters demanded an upgrade of the existing 'Ecopass' scheme,

Heavy goods vehicles charging schemes

Most European countries have implemented some form of nationwide truck charging scheme, where all hauliers pay for using public roads, either by time or distance. Whilst most heavy goods vehicles charging systems are distance-based and managed at the national level, roads within individual cities could also be included into the system. Participating cities would then receive their fair share of the proceeds, which they could spend on maintaining their local road network and on investing into more sustainable transportation and mobility schemes.

City example: Brussels HGV charging scheme

In 2016, the Belgian regions Brussels, Wallonia, and Flanders introduced a distance-base road charging system for heavy goods vehicles (HGV) on motorways and some major secondary roads. Brussels has tightened the nationwide system by applying the tolls to all roads within the city zone and by demanding higher charges compared to roads outside of the capital. The amount of the toll also depends on the emission standard: Trucks with a Euro 5 engine must pay a higher fee than those with a Euro 6 engine.

In addition to the revenue, the system enables Brussels and the two other regions to obtain more specific data on HGV traffic on their road network. These data will be used to inform mobility policy and adjust the toll system to better suit regional and local transportation objectives. The regions have the right to adapt the toll road network and the rates twice a year.

Parking management

Parking management is another powerful lever to influence car travel and the modal split of commuters and visitors. Since the 1990s parking policies have increasingly been used as a tool to manage car traffic in and around urban areas in Europe (e.g. Shoup 2005; Website push&pull).

Parking management normally is a task at the city level, giving local authorities a high degree of autonomy. Usually a municipal parking policy has four main aims (Mingardo et al. 2015):

- to contribute to a better accessibility and mobility of the urban area;
- to contribute to a better quality of life in the city (mainly a better air quality and quality of the living environment);
- to support the local economy;
- to raise municipal revenue.

Parking measures often focus on regulating visitor parking. Adequate provisions for residents such as reasonably priced annual permits in combination with a reduced parking pressure may increase to the acceptability of parking management schemes.

The availability of cheap or unmanaged parking space can make investments in high quality public transport ineffective, most of all when car parking in the city centre is cheaper than travelling by bus or tramway. Parking charges should therefore at least outweigh the cost of using public transport for two people return tickets.

More information on parking management:

Two research projects provide more evidence and practical examples on parking management:

- CIVITAS Park4SUMP: <https://park4sump.eu/>
- Push&Pull: <http://push-pull-parking.eu/>

5.2. Employers contributions

Some authorities introduced dedicated taxes on public and private employers, which are used for expanding, maintaining, and/or operating the public transport systems.

Examples are Vienna's Dienstgeberabgabe, Nottingham's Workplace Parking Levy, or the Versement Transport in Île-de-France. While revenues are reinvested into public transport in all cases, the specific tax base differs:

- a percentage of the wages paid in Île-de-France,
- the number of workplace parking spaces in Nottingham, or
- a fixed amount per employee in Vienna, where employers pay 2€ per employee per week, with exemptions for elderly employees, for employees with mental and physical handicaps, part-time employees, public authorities, etc.

City example: Workplace parking levy scheme in Nottingham (UK)

City example: Workplace parking levy scheme in Nottingham (UK)

A Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) is a specific parking management approach. It is a charge on employers based on the number of parking spaces they provide for their employees. The introduction of a WPL usually aims at raising funds for transport and mobility improvements and at discouraging commuting by car.

Introducing WPLs may require adapting parking ordinances that define minimum off-street parking requirements for buildings. Controlled parking management measures in the local area may be required to avoid displacement of off-street to on-street parking.

In Nottingham, a levy on large employer's parking at workplaces was introduced in 2012. Employers that provide 11 or more workplace parking bays are liable to pay a charge for each of those places. Importantly, employers, rather than employees, are responsible for paying any WPL charge, although employers can

choose to pass the cost of the WPL to their employees. A salary sacrifice agreement allows an employee to sacrifice part of their salary in return for a tax-exempt benefit, in this case, workplace parking.

The WPL is an annual charge, set in line with inflation. A retail price index is used to calculate yearly increases in the levy, which currently is £415 per year and parking place (2019).

In the first three years of operation, the workplace parking levy raised £25.3 million of revenue, all of which has funded improvements in the city's transport infrastructure, including the extension of the tram network and the procurement of electric buses.



City Example: Versement Transport in Île-de-France


Île-de-France Mobilités is the regional mobility authority in the Île-de-France region which comprises the City of Paris and the seven other départements of the region.

It is tasked inter alia with organising the public transport network, determining service quality, contracting PT operators, monitoring network investments, developing urban mobility plans and ensuring the financial balance of the operational expenditure.

Therefore, Île-de-France Mobilités benefits from a specific tax, the Versement Transport. This tax is levied on the employers both private and public as soon as they employ at least 11 employees. The tax is calculated as a percentage of the wages. The maximal rates are fixed by a national law and Île-de-France Mobilités decides which rate to apply (as a matter of fact maximal rates are always applied).

The Versement Transport is collected by the organisation in charge of the collection of social taxes on behalf of Île-de-France Mobilités. Tax income is used to finance the operators (RATP, SNCF and private bus companies) within the framework of operational contracts and. It also finances part of Île-de-France Mobilités investment costs, such as rolling stock renewal. The tax contributed, in 2017, to 42 % of the financial resources that covers total operation costs and part of Île-de-France Mobilités investment costs.

In the first three years of operation, the workplace parking levy raised £25.3 million of revenue, all of which has funded improvements in the city's transport infrastructure, including the extension of the tram network and the procurement of electric buses.



5.3. Value capture instruments

Public capital expenditures for infrastructure and transportation services are a precondition for urban development, and specifically for transit oriented development (TOD) which aims at enhancing public transport accessibility of new settlements. These investments contribute to increasing values of land and real estate in proximity to transport access points, and thus generate additional benefits for private property owners.

On the other hand, new residential developments produce more road traffic and greater demand for public transport services. Local authorities are faced with a situation in which the development puts increased pressure on the infrastructure they provide, while being unable to profit from the added value that they have created through granting planning permissions.

In recent years, cities introduced a variety of instruments to capture at least a part of the additional value from key beneficiaries of a project, including property owners and land developers. The rationale that those who benefit from a development and/or the provision of infrastructure and public services should make some financial contribute is a broadly accepted and powerful narrative. Value capture mechanisms are a means of linking increasing land and property values with the delivery of public transport services. The approaches differ according to the stage of the project cycle from which the income is available and according to the parties that are financially burdened.

Stamp duty land tax

Stamp duty land tax (SDLT), as introduced in England and Northern Ireland in 2003, is one such method of capturing increases in land values. Owners of properties above a certain value pay it when the property is purchased. The tax can be applied in areas that specifically benefit from public transport services. The main argument for the tax is that the availability of high quality transport services increases the value of land and that these benefits for landowners are partly captured through the SDLT (Sintropher, 2015).

While SDLT increases the municipality's general budget, its revenues can be used to re-finance the development of public transport or other measures towards more sustainable urban development (Transport for London, 2017, p. 39). Charging zones with differentiated tax rates can be defined in terms of proximity to public transport stations, either using a distance metric or an isochrones,

for example a defined walking time (Transport for London, 2017, p. 39).

Mobility Taxes

The Metropolitan Area of Barcelona (AMB) raises a metropolitan tax which inter alia is used for enhancing connectivity, mobility and functionality of the Metropolitan Area. The tax is levied on the value of real estate and it is calculated based on its cadastral value. Revenues are invested into public transport system (increasing territorial and time coverage and frequency, integrated fares systems, subsidising ticket prices etc.). AMB estimates revenue from the metropolitan tax of 123 million in 2019.¹ Revenues are recurring and can be invested both into the construction of infrastructure assets and into operation and maintenance of the public transport system.

Voluntary capture

Increasing private property value could also be captured voluntarily, through direct contributions to the funding of that investment. Voluntary capture is based on an agreement between developers or property owners and a local authority, where the developers or property owners offer a voluntary contribution towards the costs of a public infrastructure project. Voluntary contributions tend to be offered when the developer or property owner calculates that the benefits they will receive from the provision of public infrastructure outweigh the cost of investing in it. Since voluntary capture normally is a one-off payment, revenues will be used for the construction of infrastructure, not for covering the long-term operation of services.

¹https://www.metropoliabierta.com/el-pulso-de-la-ciudad/movilidad/confirmado-transporte-sera-mas-barato-barcelona_11008_102.html

Development Charges, Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levies

Granting planning permissions for a new development typically increases the value of the affected land. The added value is commonly absorbed through landowners and developers. England and Wales introduced planning obligations and community infrastructure levies (CIL). These instruments are upfront charges on granted planning permission and generate revenues for dealing with site-specific and community-wide externalities of new developments:

- Planning Obligations aim at mitigating parts of the site-specific impact of a development, either through a fixed levy, or via direct negotiation between the developer(s) and the public authority. Planning obligations can also restrict or define conditions for the way in which the land is used, through prescribing the nature of development (for example, affordable housing), compensations for loss or damage created by a development (for example, loss of open space), or mitigating a development's impact (for example, through increased public transport provision, cycle paths or pedestrian crossings).

- CIL: While planning obligations are intended to make an individual projects acceptable in planning terms (Everett & Smith, 2016), CIL focuses on the wider area and a broader development context. Revenues from CIL are used for public transport, roads, schools, or health facilities, for example. As such, CIL and planning obligations can be implemented complementary. Where CILs are in force, planning obligations are intended to be "scaled back to those matters that are directly related to a specific site" (CIL Review Team, 2015). It is a fixed charge on the development of new floor space. The charging rates are determined on a case-by-case scenario, depending inter alia on the size, the intended use, or the location. Charges are defined in advance so that revenues can be calculated prior to the execution of the works during the planning process. The corresponding charge is invoiced at the starting date of the development, following a communication sent by the local authority. A deadline for the payment of the levy is established on the invoice.

City Example: Planning Contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy in Birmingham (UK)

Birmingham City Council's SUMP Document (Birmingham Connected) was developed to support the delivery of policies set out in the Birmingham Development Plan. Planning contributions are a mechanism to secure funding as a result of development. There are two funding mechanisms combined in Birmingham:

- Planning obligations under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (S106) are negotiated as a result of planning permissions and will seek funds to mitigate or compensate for development (e.g. introduce a sustainable travel plan for a new city centre office development, or a new pedestrian crossing adjacent to a new school). Each agreement is a legal contract and spending is ring-fenced for the purpose within the agreement and is time bound.
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a charge across certain types of development in certain areas (dependent on viability). 80% of funds are spent on strategic infrastructure to deliver the Development Plan, 15% is passed to neighbourhoods in which development takes place, and the remaining 5% is for management and administration.

S106 funds have contributed significant amounts to the Birmingham Cycle Revolution, resurfacing towpaths for off road cycling, creation of new cycle lanes, or cycle friendly road crossings. Planning Contributions is a useful and well-established tool. However, it can be difficult to generate enough money to complete significant infrastructure projects as the funds are ring-fenced for specific projects, in particular areas.

CIL is earmarked (as part of a wider funding package) for the redevelopment of Perry Barr train station to increase capacity in time for the Commonwealth Games, but also once the Games are over, to provide additional capacity of the new housing created post Games. CIL is much more flexible and can generate large funds relatively quickly. However, setting up a CIL is costly and can take over 12 months. It takes time to change CIL rates (i.e. to reflect market conditions), so it is possible that maximum amounts may not be secured.

Both S106 and CIL require an understanding of development viability. Specialists may be needed to conduct viability assessments for individual planning applications to maximise S106 contributions, and specialist support is needed to develop a CIL charging schedule.

More information: <http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/cil>

Development charges and value capture are one-of and non-recurring levies. They can be used for financing transport infrastructure in newly developed areas – but will not be suitable for maintaining, operating and retrofitting existing services and assets.

Development charges have been criticised for encouraging urban sprawl since they facilitate the development of peripheral areas. On the other hand, development charges can also form part of transit oriented development approaches that foster public transport in the hinterland of core municipalities. This requires close collaboration among municipalities in the functional area and among spatial and mobility planning departments.

Tax Increment Financing

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is a financing mechanism to enable public sector infrastructure investment in a dedicated urban renewal district through locally generated additional revenues. It was created in California to rehabilitate urban areas (Haider & Donaldson, 2016). The mechanism behind TIF is that the public sector borrows money to finance projects such as infrastructure development. Debt repayments are then covered from ring-fencing expected future additional tax revenues (e.g. real estate taxes) that would not occur if the project was not implemented.

TIF operates by defining a catchment area of properties benefitting from the development of the assets. While the actual level of property tax is expected to increase with the uplift of land values resulting from the development, property taxes received by the local taxation authority are frozen at the level previous to the development for a fixed term, e.g. 25 years. In this period, the difference between the increased property taxes and the frozen level is transferred to a TIF authority and used to pay off the debt taken out to build the infrastructure.

Cities may apply tax increment financing to develop public and non-motorised transport in certain areas. However, evaluation has shown that car-free areas significantly increase well-being of the inhabitants, leading to premium property values.




Figure 2: Working principle of TIFs (Haider and Donaldson 2016)

City example: Edinburgh St James Growth Accelerator Model

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is being piloted in Scotland as a way to re-finance infrastructure projects that unlock the development of a specific urban area. The Scottish Futures Trust has issued a set of guidance documents on Tax Increment Financing: <https://www.scottishfuturestrust.org.uk/publications/tag/tif>

The Growth Accelerator Model (GAM) is a variant on the established TIF model that has been piloted in Edinburgh, Scotland. It consists of a set of working arrangements between the City of Edinburgh Council, the Scottish Government and the St James Quarter of Edinburgh.

The total cost of the assets being delivered via the Edinburgh GAM is £61 million. The main element is a complete redevelopment of the Picardy Place junction that will improve traffic flows as well as delivering enhanced pedestrian routes; segregated cycle ways; and improved public spaces. The works will also make provision for the safeguarded tram extension and for a new tram/bus interchange to reduce motor vehicle traffic in the city centre. The £61 million is also being used to deliver an energy centre and improvement works to several surrounding roads. The assets delivered by the Edinburgh GAM are facilitating the Edinburgh St James development, a £850m regeneration of Edinburgh's East End delivering new retail and leisure space, hotels, and homes that will support hundreds of new jobs and attract significant additional visitors to Edinburgh's city centre.

The fundamental principle of GAM is the same as that of TIF: money is borrowed to invest in assets that will drive growth, the proceeds of which are used to amortise the debt. Subject to meeting targets, the Council will receive annual payments from the Scottish Government to repay the borrowing.

However, GAM has some distinctive elements. Firstly, the money received by the Council from the Scottish Government is not based solely on increased tax revenues being generated, but also upon the Council meeting non-financial targets around employment and training opportunities. Secondly, the private sector has an on-going financial involvement, with the private developer benefiting from the growth assets also making payments to the Council to enable repayment of the borrowing as well as sharing any super-profits with the public sector. The payments to the Council from the Scottish Government and the private developer will be reduced if the cost of delivering the assets is reduced, incentivising the developer to work to bring down costs.

5.4. Local Option Sales Taxes

Several cities and counties in the United States have introduced Local Option Sales Taxes (LOST) to fund transportation projects. These counties levy a surcharge on sales taxes for a limited period of time (e.g. 1% over 10 years). Revenues are used locally and earmarked to fund transport improvements, which are pre-defined in a project list. Local Options Sales Taxes have to pass a public referendum and are often administered by a designated transportation authority that oversees the use of the income. Whether municipalities in the EU are legally allowed to levy these forms of taxes needs to be determined on a member state level.

6. National level funding

Financial transfers from the national budget or other higher tier governments to municipalities are commonly used to subsidise the operation of public transport services.

Beyond this, some national governments also provide grants and funding schemes for projects or other purposes, such as research and development or market diffusion of low-carbon technologies. Approval of grants is often linked to specific conditions, such as the assumption of own contributions from the municipal budget or from other funding sources.

Example: The UK's Local Transport Sustainability Fund (LSTF)

The LSTF was set up as a funding programme for sustainable transport initiatives in England. In competitive calls, cities could apply for large (<£5m) and smaller project funding with the main aims of

- (1) supporting the local economy and facilitating economic development through the reduction of congestion, improving the reliability of journey times, or enhancing the access to employment and other services
- (2) reducing carbon emissions through a shift to sustainable mobility modes.

The LSTF programme ran from July 2011 to March 2015, with an extension year until March 2016. During this period, 96 projects were awarded a total of £540m funding (Sloman et al., 2018).

Example: The German National Electric Bus Funding Programme

The German Federal Ministry of the Environment has created a ca. 300 Million Euro fund to support cities and public transport operators to procure electric and plug-in electric buses. The programme (duration: 2018-2022) covers up to 80 % of the additional investment costs compared to conventional diesel fuelled buses (40% for plug-in hybrid buses).

Costs for charging infrastructure and other measures necessary for the commissioning of electric buses (e.g. training courses and workshop facilities) are also eligible. In order to achieve the greatest possible impacts cities and areas where the air pollutant limits are exceeded are given preferential support.

A report of the Zero Emission Urban Bus System project (ZeEUS, 2017) identified national programmes to foster the market penetration of e-buses in Germany, Italy Poland, Spain, Sweden, and the UK. Almost all EU member states (and many regions) have set up funding programmes related to SUMP development (see Durlin, 2018 Chapter 3.3.3). Often, mobility related funding programmes are initiated in the context of meeting greenhouse gas emission goals, the adaptation to climate change or air quality standards and thus are managed by Ministries for the Environment.

7. European Funding and Financing Sources

The European Commission has implemented a vast number of initiatives and programmes that can be used for (co-)funding and financing sustainable mobility measures. European funding programmes will mostly contribute to investments (e.g. building a tram line or procuring buses), but rarely to operating costs of infrastructures and services. Among those are Structural and Investment Funds, the European Fund for Strategic Investments, the Connecting Europe Facility, the LIFE programme or Research and innovation programmes, as outlined in the following.

Cohesion Policy – European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF)

For the 2014-2020 programming period, European Cohesion Policy has set 11 thematic objectives, among those thematic objective 4: “Supporting the shift towards a lowcarbon economy” and thematic objective 7 “promoting sustainable transport and improving network infrastructures”. Municipal authorities can apply for funds to support economically viable projects in line with EU policy objectives.

European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) are delivered through nationally co-financed programmes and implemented by Member States and their regions. Programmes and applications are managed by Managing Authorities on the Member States’ or provincial level. Depending on the development status of the region, the Funds can cover between 50% and 85% of the total project costs. Member States or regions define investment priorities and preconditions for accessing the funds in operational programmes.

The ESIF contains five separate funds, of which the European Regional Development Fund ERDF and the Cohesion Fund are particularly relevant for urban transport and mobility projects. The transition towards a low carbon economy with a focus on integrated Sustainable Urban Development (Article 7 ERDF Regulation) is one priority of the ERDF. Measures “should be developed within the context of a wider integrated strategy with the clear aim of creating a coherent and integrated response to the problems of the urban area concerned.” The current programming period runs from 2014 to 2020. The Cohesion Fund supports investments in priority trans-European transport networks, including low-carbon transport systems in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility; For the

2014-2020 period, eligible countries are: Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

Other European Funding Sources

- The Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) is a fund for pan-European infrastructure investment in transport, energy and digital projects, which aim at a greater connectivity between member states. It operates through grants, financial guarantees and project bonds.
- The LIFE programme is the EU’s funding instrument for the environment and climate action. It funds innovative projects that demonstrate new techniques and methods.
- Horizon 2020 is the biggest EU Research and Innovation programme and aims to achieve smart, sustainable and inclusive economic growth. H2020 is organised in seven thematic sections called “Societal Challenges”, of which challenge No. 4 is on smart, green and integrated transport. Local authorities are able to partner with researchers and other stakeholders to access funding under the programme and they may also benefit from the outcomes of Horizon 2020 actions. Horizon 2020 also finances the ELENA programme (Chapter 7.1) and co-finances the CIVITAS network. CIVITAS is network of cities for cities dedicated to cleaner, better transport. <https://civitas.eu/>
- Climate-KIC: the European Institute of Innovation & Technology’s (EIT) Climate-KIC supports initiatives aiming at decarbonising. Inter alia, the KIC supports cities on how decarbonise urban environments, including the urban mobility sector.

Further Information: Overview of European funding options

A more comprehensive overview can be found on the Eltis website <http://www.eltis.org/resources/eu-funding>

The Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy also provides a database on financing options for transforming ambitious sustainable energy and climate action plans into projects: <https://www.eumayors.eu/support/funding.html>

7.1. Support instruments for the application process

In order to help cities and regions during the application for European project funding and to facilitate the combination of structural funds with other sources of financing, the European Commission and the European Investment Bank (EIB) have set up special support instruments to foster the take up:

- JASPERS (Joint Assistance to Support Projects in European Regions) is an initiative aimed at improving the quality of investment through providing advice for a better and smarter use of EU Funds. It is a partnership between the European Commission, the EIB and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. JASPERS offers support for the preparation of EU-funded projects through advisory, capacity building activities, and the review of projects before or after submission to the Commission.
- JESSICA (Joint European Support for Sustainable Investment in City Areas) is a policy initiative of the European Commission developed jointly with the EIB and in collaboration with the Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB). The JESSICA initiative supports sustainable

urban development and regeneration through financial engineering mechanisms, including the leverage of EU structural funds to unlock more investment.

- The European Investment Bank's ELENA programme provides grants for the development (not the implementation!) of programmes that focus on energy efficiency in a broad sense. Eligible projects need a total investment volume above EUR 30 million with 4-year implementation period. Smaller projects can be supported when they are integrated into larger investment programmes. Public or private entities pursuing large-scale transport and mobility measures in urban areas can apply for an up to 90% coverage of technical assistance/project development costs. Eligible costs include internal staff costs, and external expertise, including feasibility and design studies, structuring of programmes, business plans, legal and financial advisory, the preparation of tendering processes, or costs for bundling smaller projects into bankable packages. Having a SUMP is one criterion in the evaluation of applications.

photo © Stefan Werland



Combining European funds and financing instruments

In its Guide to combining EFSI with other EU funds, the EU Commission provides an example how different European funding and financing instruments can work together:

“Different funds can finance different parts of the project, so you can have the EFSI finance one part and structural funds finance another. For example, a project promoter

could apply for structural funds to pay grants for a feasibility study for the project. In addition, structural funds could finance the part of the project that would not get a financial return to allow for its repayment and to cover the operating costs. For the part of the project which will generate revenues the promoter could apply for EIB financing backed by the EFSI guarantee. This combination makes the project “bankable” and eligible for the EIB Group to consider.”

8. Debt mechanisms and external financing

Most of the instruments discussed so far generate cash flows only after the project or service starts its operation. Using expected future returns to re-finance upfront investments requires financial instruments that allow project generated revenues or cost savings to service the debt during the operation period.

8.1. Loans

Loans are a classic source of investment capital for urban mobility projects. This section focuses on dedicated programmes of the European Investment Bank, whose investment priorities are aligned with EU policy objectives, including climate-friendly transport, sustainable and safe mobility, and innovative solutions. The EIB provides long-term investment loans for large-scale mobility projects over a minimum project size of € 50m. EIB loans may cover up to 50% of project costs, equivalent of minimum €25m. To achieve the necessary threshold, smaller projects may be bundled under one framework loan. Projects can be compiled over a range of sectors, including transport, waste management, social housing, etc. EIB framework loans can also be used to provide co-financing for e.g. ESIF funds (Chapter 7).

Since the EIB expects re-payment of loans and low interest payments, and projects should contribute to EU policy objectives, investment projects have to proof their economical, financial, technical and environmental feasibility. Projects will not have to yield revenues, but have to demonstrate added value, for example by reducing costs for public budgets in the mid term. Besides providing investment capital, EIB approval of a project is considered a proof of quality and helps attracting other investors.

According to the 2011 Transport Lending Policy¹, sustainable urban public transport is fully in line with the Bank' objectives and EIB financing is not subject to any specific restriction. The EIB supports the construction, extension and rehabilitation of public transport networks, including rapid transit bus systems; the procurement of public transport vehicles; electronic ticketing, traffic management and communication systems; cycling and pedestrian networks; schemes based on the user/polluter pay principles as well as city logistics measures aiming at improving freight distribution in urban areas.²

¹ <https://www.eib.org/en/infocentre/publications/all/eib-transport-lending-policy.htm>

² <https://www.eib.org/en/projects/sectors/transport/index.htm#tm>

The Cleaner Transport Facility

The Cleaner Transport Facility is a joint initiative of the European Commission and the EIB, launched in December 2016. The Facility supports investments in alternative fuelled public transport fleets and their associated infrastructure in cities and urban areas. It combines lending, funds, guarantees, advisory services

The Transport Lending Policy also stresses that urban public transport investments shall form part of integrated urban mobility plans “aiming at providing sustainable urban transport through a combination of different transport modes and measures acting on both the supply and demand sides, while being coherent with existing urban development plans. Standalone projects that are not part of an integrated urban mobility plan are unlikely to be effective in reducing congestion and environmental externalities and should not be supported.”

While all investment projects are expected to demonstrate a high economic rate of return, including externalities, public transport, rail, inter-modal and waterborne transport projects are accepted with lower returns compared to road projects. The EIB's lending objectives also seek a share of at least 25% of projects to contribute to climate change mitigation or adaptation. Public transport, rail, inter-modal and waterborne transport projects generally are counted towards this indicator.

The European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI) is a joint initiative of European Commission and European Investment Bank which supports strategic investments in European key areas, including transport. The Fund is a guarantee mechanism, which allows the EIB to provide financing for higher risk projects. EFSI financing is demand-driven and provides support for projects everywhere in the EU. According to the 2017 EFSI 2.0 regulation at least 40% of EFSI financed projects should contribute to climate action in line with the Paris Agreement.

According to Article 9 of the EFSI Regulation¹, the guarantee shall be granted for EIB financing and investment operations that inter alia support smart and sustainable urban mobility projects (targeting accessibility, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, energy consumption and accidents); projects connecting nodes to TEN-T infrastructures; sustainable urban and rural development; climate change; the expansion of the use of renewable energy; energy efficiency and energy saving; or tourism.

European Energy Efficiency Fund (EEEF)

The EEEF provides financing for energy efficiency investments, including low-carbon mobility solutions such as e-mobility, car sharing, etc. The EEEF aims to attract private investments to sustainable mobility projects.

¹ Regulation (EU) 2015/1017 of the European Parliament and of the Council

The European Investment Advisory Hub

The European Investment Advisory Hub is a partnership between the European Investment Bank Group and the European Commission. It was established as a single point of entry for project promoters, public authorities and the private sector to advisory services and technical assistance. By offering advisory support to European project promoters, the EIAH supports the identification, preparation and development of investment projects across the EU.



8.2. City Bonds

City bonds are debt instruments to unlock investment capital for expenditures, including transport infrastructure projects and service operation. They yield immediate capital for the issuer while repayments can be extended over a long time period of approx. 20-30 years (Kim, 2016). City governments issue municipal or city bonds, often with the intention to finance transport infrastructure or services. The issuer of a bond sets a fixed annual interest rate and a time frame for repayment and sells the bonds to creditors. Bond-holders receive a promise that the interest and the principle will be repaid on a regular schedule. Due to fixed returns and a pre-defined maturity date, bonds generally have a lower risk profile compared to equity instruments. This makes bonds more appealing to institutional investors such as pension funds and insurance companies who are attracted to predictability, steady pay-outs and capital preservation. In many countries bond purchasers profit from tax exemptions.

Revenue bonds are often used to finance major infrastructure projects. Interests will be paid from direct project related revenues such as fares and user tolls but also indirect sources such as cost savings e.g. from more energy efficient buses.



© Stefan Werland / Wuppertal Institute

8.3. Green City Bonds

Green bonds are bonds with proceeds ring-fenced for sustainable projects. Issuers of green city bonds commit to using the capital raised for environmentally beneficial purposes, including sustainable mobility related projects. Examples are the procurement of e-buses and related infrastructure, the extension of tramways or the installation of BRT systems.

City Example: The RATP green bonds programme

The French state-owned public transport operator RATP (Régie Autonome des Transports Parisiens) launched a green bonds programme in 2017. The proceeds of the Green Bond will be invested into future projects or used to refinance existing projects that comply with RATP's CSR objectives and fall into one of the following categories: energy transition and climate-change mitigation; pollution prevention; natural resource prevention; or other sustainability objectives such as noise reduction or enhanced comfort for passengers.

In a first step, RATP aimed at a € 500 million injection with a 10-years issue for financing the renewal of railway rolling stock, upgrading of a metro line, and the purchase of electric locomotives for the maintenance of RER infrastructures. With € 1.6 billion of orders, the bond was three times oversubscribed. A second green bond was issued in June 2019.

More Information: <https://www.ratp.fr/en/en/la-ratp-et-les-green-bonds>



The Climate Bonds Initiative - Standards for Transport Projects

The Climate Bonds Initiative has issued sector specific criteria for transport projects eligible for Certification under the Climate Bonds Standard and Certification Scheme.

The Climate Bonds Standard and Certification Scheme is a labelling scheme for bonds. Rigorous scientific criteria ensure that it is consistent with the 2 degrees Celsius warming limit in the Paris Agreement. The Scheme is used globally by bond issuers, governments, investors and the financial markets to prioritise investments which genuinely contribute to addressing climate change.

Public transport projects such as urban trams, metro systems and bike transport systems as well as vehicles propelled by fully electric engines or hydrogen fuel cells are automatically eligible. For other forms of transport, the Criteria define specific thresholds which the projects and assets will have to meet in order to be eligible.

More Information: <https://www.climatebonds.net/standard/transport>



Cities may also consider other financing options:

- Leasing e.g. of public transport vehicles may be an option for bus fleet or company fleet renewal.
- The European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI) aims at mobilising private financing for projects with a high risk profile, including transport projects. The EFSI provides loans, guarantees, and equity investments, but no grants. EFSI funding can, for example, complement ESI Funds (Chapter 7.1) or private investments.

9. Facilitating the Involvement of the Private Sector

PPPs are a form of procurement and contract arrangements between public authorities and the private sector. They aim at delivering public infrastructure projects and/or services under a long-term contract. PPP arrangements vary in terms of their transfer of risks and management responsibilities to the private partner, the ownership of assets (infrastructure, vehicles, etc.), revenue generation, and the distribution of investments. If properly managed, PPPs can improve efficiency along the full project cycle, including operation, and allocate risks to the party better prepared to address them.

According to the European Court of Auditors, engaging the private sector can reduce direct upfront investments and operation costs for the local authority. PPPs are also mechanisms to share risks among several partners: “The private partner is often responsible for risks, associated with the design, construction, financing, operation and maintenance of the infrastructure, while the public partner usually takes on regulatory and political risks” (European Court of Auditors, 2018, p. 12). In a SUMP context, PPPs can be concluded for the

- the provision of services, for example public transport or sharing services;
- the construction of transport infrastructure;
- the construction and operation of transport infrastructure.




Figure 3: Types of Public-Private Partnerships. Source: (Ardila-Gomez & Ortegon-Sanchez, 2016, p. 80)

PPP and public governance

Private sector engagement for the provision of public services has provoked highly charged political debates. While proponents argue that contracting private operators through competitive tendering reduces construction and operating costs and increases efficiency, opponents fear that contracting and operation of services and infrastructure privatises short-term profits on the expense of service quality and working conditions. Achieving an ‘optimal’ degree of public sector engagement is a political decision and cannot be answered here.

Regulation (EC) No 1370/2007 on public passenger transport services (17) states that...

“...competent authorities are free to establish social and qualitative criteria in order to maintain and raise quality standards for public service obligations, for instance with regard to minimal working conditions, passenger rights, the needs of persons with reduced mobility, environmental protection, the security of passengers and employees as well as collective agreement obligations and other rules and agreements concerning workplaces and social protection at the place where the service is provided. In order to ensure transparent and comparable terms of competition between operators and to avert the risk of social dumping, competent authorities should be free to impose specific social and service quality standards.”

It is important to understand that PPPs do not substitute for effective governance. PPPs are often criticised for commercialising public services, including the risk of maximising short-term profits for the private sector at the expense of service quality, while socialising losses and delegating risks to the public.

Local authorities need adequate capacities to act in the public interest and to ensure the fulfilment of the private sector's obligations. PPPs thus require performance based contracts with clear quality standards and levels of services, sound performance monitoring and reporting obligations for the contractual partners. Setting up a quality management system is highly advisable. Contracts also need to define clear rules for non-compliance and failures to meet agreed standards and a mandate for enforcing mechanisms. Periodic renegotiations are essential for adapting standards and agreed levels of services and to remain responsive to changes in demand, needs and priorities. Corresponding requirements should already be specified in the tender documents.

9.1. Engaging private companies as service providers

Usually, local public transport services do not operate cost effectively and are financed through a combination of user fees, public subsidies, and other sources such as revenue from the rental of advertising space. PPP contracts for the provision of services can contribute to financing public transport projects and reduce the immediate financial burden on the municipal budget. Arrangements can take different forms, depending on the allocation of risks between public and private partners and the degree of public regulation. Most important forms are service delivery schemes and concession agreements.

Under service delivery schemes, private companies act as service providers, for example the operation of bus lines. In the Terms of Reference (ToR), the public authority defines levels of services (e.g. km/year, routes, stops, frequencies), quality standards (e.g. GPS and intelligent transport management system equipment, on-board wifi, passenger counting, or on board information system), hours of operation, or the number and maximum age of vehicles employed. Other provisions may include the participation in an integrated fare system, or the elaboration of environmental plans.

Service contracts are awarded through tendering processes. Private partners are paid for the provision of the service, often as a lump sum based on an estimation of operating costs. Under these agreements, the private actor assumes the technical risk (operation costs) while the public administration finances the gap between the revenues generated and the agreed reimbursements of the operator. Annual payments can also be determined based on performance (e.g. the number of transported passengers) with a guaranteed minimum payment. Service delivery contracts often entail bonus-malus schemes that financially reward over-fulfilment of the agreed service level or penalties poor performance, for example in terms of punctuality, passenger satisfaction, or vehicle quality. More information on these schemes can be found in the SUMP Topic Guide on Public Procurement of Sustainable Urban Mobility Measures. Under concession agreements, a private company pays for the exclusive right to operate an infrastructure asset (such as a toll road or bridge) or a bus line over a defined period of time. The concession is re-financed through revenues generated, with the private operator taking over both demand/income risk and technical risk. That means that concessions are only viable for profitable

projects or public transport lines, unless the public authority compensates parts of the financial shortfalls. Digitalisation has created a number of new business models which support car-free, multimodal travelling, complement public transport services, and thus may contribute to a city's SUMP vision. Services such as bike- and car-sharing systems or on-demand services can fill service gaps and enhance first- and last mile connectivity. Mobility companies have introduced e-hailing services that facilitate ordering and/or borrowing a vehicle or a service (public transport tickets, cars, taxis, bikes and e-bikes, or any other form of transport) by using computer or smartphone.

Ride pooling and taxi sharing are new, flexible mobility options that may supplement public mass transport systems, specifically in times or areas with low demand for transport. Private mobility companies can provide urban public transport services as part of service contracts. Under these agreements, the private partner receives performance-based payments for the provision of the service, be it bike-sharing or ride hailing systems. Cities can stipulate tariffs, network, quality standards and other criteria such as the location of bike-sharing stations close to public transport stops in their mass transit plans and formulate tender documents accordingly. Standards may also address negative impacts such as blocked sidewalks, poorly maintained bicycles, appropriate insurance, and safety standards for rental vehicles. More information on bike-sharing funding mechanisms can be accessed at: <http://www.konsult.leeds.ac.uk/pg/59/>.

Integrating private sharing systems into the public transport system

Car- and bike-sharing systems are increasingly operated by private companies, most often independent of municipal transport planning and thus not managed through a contract or legal agreement with the city.

To secure their contribution to a sustainable urban transport system, cities need to develop management and licensing structures. The National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) has issued 'Guidelines for the Regulation and Management of Shared Active Transportation'. While the Guidelines focus on the United States, they may also serve as a reference for European cities.

9.2. Public private partnerships in infrastructure development

Infrastructure projects are capital-intensive, with most of the costs incurred during the construction phase. Since potential revenues are not generated until after commissioning, PPPs can be a means of leveraging of private funds for transport infrastructure projects to finance upfront investments. Private sector companies are repaid either by contractual repayments or they are entitled to future user charges and fares under a long-term concession arrangement (European Court of Auditors 2018). After the concession contract expires, the concession holder hands over asset to the public authority.

Typical projects that are delivered under PPP contracts include ports and airports, motorways, bridges, tunnels, or parking facilities. While PPPs are relatively common in large-scale infrastructure projects, their applicability may also be explored for smaller urban projects such as the construction and operation of tramlines.

Common arrangements for the provision of infrastructures and services are Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT), Build-Own-Operate-Transfer (BOOT) and Design, Build, Finance and Operate (DBFO) schemes, among others. The selection of an adequate PPP model depends on the specific properties of the project, on budgetary considerations, and on traditions, conventions and legal requirements in the respective countries.


- BOT means that a private sector company builds and operates an infrastructure asset for a defined period of time (e.g. 20 years). During this time, the private party operates and maintains the asset. The company recoups its investments from project related income (fares, tolls) and transfers the assets to the public administration after the end of the concession agreement free of charge.
- Under BOOT arrangements, the private enterprise develops and operates the project for a defined period. Other than under BOT contracts, the private company is the owner of the asset, which the public authority buys at a predefined price or market price after the expiration of the concession period.
- DBMFO is a PPP contract where the private partner is responsible for designing, building, maintaining, financing and operating and infrastructure asset. Revenues can come from concession models (user charges) or reimbursements by the public authority based on the delivered services.

While PPPs are often considered an effective and efficient way to realise infrastructure projects, the European Court of Auditors points to shortcomings and potential risks associated with the engagement of the private sector in the public realm: Implementing successful PPP projects requires a high degree of administrative capability and expertise, time, and negotiation skills from the sides of the local authority, well beyond expertise needed for conventional procurement processes. Moreover, the Court highlights the risk that private partners may withdraw from a project if the anticipated revenues from future concessions are reduced and the financial viability of a project is threatened. For private enterprises, the public procurement system is extremely effortful what might result in a low competition and put local authorities into a weak negotiation position.

10. Overview of funding and financing instruments

This overview has shown that there is a large number of funding and financing options for supporting sustainable urban mobility. Still, there is no one size fits all combination of instruments that is suitable for all projects in all member states. An adequate combination needs to be defined case-by-case, depending on factors such as the size and nature of the project, the municipality's budgetary situation, legal competences of cities, or the availability of funding sources from the regional, national and European level. One key message, however, is that funding and financing plans need to consider the entire SUMP package, also taking into account the potential impact of other planned measures. Funding and financing plans need to be coordinated with other departments, including the fiscal administration, and with surrounding municipalities.

The following figure provides an overview of the instruments which were discussed in this Topic Guide. They are structured (1) along providers of funding and financing (different tiers of government, private sector) and (2) along the project life cycle during which financial resources are available.



List of references

- Ardila-Gomez, A., & Ortegon-Sanchez, A. (2016). Sustainable Urban Transport Financing from the Sidewalk to the Subway : Capital, Operations, and Maintenance Financing. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/23521>
- Chinellato, M., Staelens, P., Wennberg, H., Sundberg, R., Böhler, S., Brand, L., ... Dragutescu, A. (2017). Users' needs analysis on SUMP take up. Deliverable D1.2 of the SUMP Up project. Retrieved from <http://sumps-up.eu/>
- CIL Review Team. (2015). A New Approach to Developer Contributions. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/589637/CIL_REPORT_2016.pdf
- de Groot, J. I. M., & Schuitema, G. (2012). How to Make the Unpopular Popular? Policy Characteristics, Social Norms and the Acceptability of Environmental Policies. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 19–20, 100–107.
- Durlin, T. (2018). Status of SUMP in European member states. Retrieved from http://sumps-up.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Tools_and_Resources/Reports/SUMPs_Up_D5.1_SUMP_in_Member_States_report_no_annex.pdf
- European Commission (2014). An Investment Plan for Europe.
- European Court of Auditors. (2018). Public Private Partnerships in the EU: Widespread shortcomings and limited benefits (Vol. 09). Retrieved from https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR18_09/SR_PPP_EN.pdf
- Everett, M., & Smith, L. (2016). Planning Obligations (Section 106 Agreements). Retrieved from <https://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/CBP-7200#fullreport>
- Haider, M., & Donaldson, L. (2016). Can tax increment financing support transportation infrastructure investment? Retrieved from http://munkschool.utoronto.ca/imfg/uploads/339/imfgpaper_no25_tax_increment_financing_haider_donaldson_march_30_2016.pdf
- Kim, J., New Cities Foundation. (2016). Handbook on Urban Infrastructure Finance.
- Shergold, I., & Parkhurst, G. (2016). The Economic Benefits of Sustainable Urban Mobility Measures: Independent Review of Evidence: Report. Retrieved from http://www.evidence-project.eu/images/pdf/EVIDENCE_Main_Report.pdf
- Sintropher. (2015). Property / Land Value Capture - Stamp Tax. Briefing Paper 2. Retrieved from <https://www.polisnetwork.eu/publicdocuments/download/1752/document/stamp-tax-2---finalpolis.pdf>
- Sloman, L., Cairns, S., Goodman, A., Hopkin, J., Taylor, I., Hopkinson, L., ... Dillon, M. (2018). Impact of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund: Synthesis of Evidence.
- Transport for London. (2017). Land Value Capture. Final Report. Retrieved from https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/land_value_capture_report_transport_for_london.pdf
- ZeEUS. (2017). Analysis of Existing Legislation and Funding Applicable to Urban Electric Buses. Retrieved from <http://zeeus.eu/uploads/deliverables/documents/d516-analysis-of-existing-legislation-and-funding-applicable-to-urban-electric-buses.pdf>

www.eltis.org